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1. **INTRODUCTION**

The following Historic Structures/Sites Report Phase 1 for eight contiguous properties at 226, 228, 230, and 232 East Anapamu Street, 1117 and 1121 Garden Street, and 223 G and 223H East Figueroa Street was requested by the owner, Figamu LLC, because the buildings are older than 50 years (see Site Plan below). This study was conducted to analyze the significance of the buildings (see Figure 1 for vicinity map). The report meets the City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment requirements for a Phase 1 Historical Study. Alexandra C. Cole of Preservation Planning Associates prepared the report, using in part historical research prepared by historian Ronald Nye in 2014 for buildings 226, 228, 230, and 232 East Anapamu Street. At the HLC review of this report on August 23, 2017, the Commission asked for additional information in the form of a Cultural Landscape Study of the block encompassing the proposed project. Post/Hazeltine prepared this further study, which is an Appendix to this Phase 1 report.

2. **DOCUMENTS REVIEW**

The following sources within the *City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites* (January 2002) were consulted to see if the subject buildings had already been declared historic resources: “Designated Historic Structures/Sites” (Appendix B) and “City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List” (Appendix C). None of the subject buildings were listed as City Structures of Merit or Landmarks, nor were they determined eligible as historic in the 1978 City Survey (Anderle 1978).

3. **SITE HISTORY**

The land comprising present-day Santa Barbara originally was the home of the Barbareño Chumash, who settled along the coast from Carpinteria to Goleta. A Chumash village, Syukhtun was located along Cabrillo Boulevard and a second, Taynayan, inland near Pedregosa (Mission) Creek on the upper East side. When Spain began to colonize California with missions and pueblos, this land was claimed by King Carlos of Spain and then granted to the Franciscan fathers when the Presidio and Mission were founded in Santa Barbara between 1782-1786. The area became part of the Pueblo lands of Santa Barbara to be used by the Mission and the Presidio.

When Mexico became independent from Spain in 1822, it secularized the missions and sold off their lands in an attempt to break the Spanish hold in California. When California became a state in 1850, the newly-established City of Santa Barbara inherited the Pueblo lands and hired Captain Salisbury Haley to survey the town, laying upon the former winding streets of the
pueblo an American grid pattern composed of blocks, streets, and parks. A three-member committee consisting of Eugene Lies, Antonio Maria De la Guerra and Joaquin Carrillo was appointed by the mayor and Common Council to name the new streets created by the Haley survey. Because two of the members of this committee were Californios, many of the street names referred to names of early explorers, settlers, or events related to the history of Santa Barbara from its inception in 1782 until the survey in 1851.

The land where the subject eight buildings are located lies in Block 122 (162) of the City, as laid out by the Haley survey, bounded by Anapamu Street, Garden Street, Figueroa Street, and Santa Barbara Street. Santa Barbara Street was named in honor of the patron saint of the City, Anapamu Street for the Chumash word for “rising place”, Garden Street for the de la
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Guerra/Presidio gardens which were located at Cota and Ortega Streets, and Figueroa Street for Jose Figueroa, governor of Alta California from 1833-1835 (Days 1986: 192-5).

Although the streets were evenly laid out in the Wackenreuder Map of 1853 which codified the Haley Survey, in actuality the town was little developed at this time. In fact, many of the proposed streets could not be constructed in their entirety because adobe houses were in the way of the proposed routes. The 1870s became a time of great growth and change in downtown Santa Barbara. This change was fueled in part by the advertising of journalist Charles Nordhoff, working for the New York Tribune, who visited Santa Barbara in 1872 and then wrote California - A Book for Travelers and Settlers, which introduced the benefits of the Santa Barbara climate. As well the construction of Stearns Wharf, with its ability to handle both passenger ships and freighters, enabled redwood to be shipped cheaply from northern California to provide building materials for new houses, which were modeled on eastern and Midwestern architectural styles, such as Italianate, Eastlake and Queen Anne, rather than the earlier Hispanic adobe houses. The population of Santa Barbara rapidly expanded, as Anglos settled and developed the downtown State Street area, from Gutierrez to De la Guerra Streets, with brick commercial buildings housing all the services a fledgling town needed, such as hotels, restaurants, grocery stores, billiard parlors, saloons, variety stores, livery stables, dry goods shops, millinery shops, a post office, liquor stores, drug stores, butcher shops, barber shops, cigar stores, and lumber yards.

4. FIELD INVENTORY

Setting

The eight subject houses in block 122 (now 162) were built between the 1880s and 1927. 226 East Anapamu, according to research by historian Ron Nye, was built in the late 1880s. The three houses at 228, 230, and 232 East Anapamu Street, identical in layout and style, were constructed c. 1905. The two houses at 1117 and 1121 Garden Street, with the center house at 1119 Garden Street, also identical in layout and style, were also constructed c. 1905 (Anderle 1978). (See Figure 2. 1907 Sanborn Map). The two houses at 223 G and 223H East Figueroa Street, as well as 223 F and 223E, according to a building permit log, were constructed in 1916 by the Sullivan Brothers. In 1925, owner Jack Hayden added the four cottages 223 A, B, C, and D at the front of the property (City building permit A-1183A-D, November 16, 1925). In 1927, owner Anton C. Zvolanek added two 18’ x 27” three-car garages at the rear of 223G and 223H (City building permit A-3168, June 20, 1927). These garages have been replaced with modern plywood storage sheds.

The 1907 Sanborn Map indicates that the subject block bounded by East Anapamu Street, Garden Street, East Figueroa Street and Santa Barbara Street contained 24 single family houses, mostly one-story (see figure 2. Sanborn Map 1907). By 1930, as the City’s population expanded, this same block contained 44 houses. Several of the single family houses had been converted into apartments, and on almost every lot along Santa Barbara and East Figueroa Streets extra dwellings had been added at the rear or a single residence on the lot had been torn down and replaced with multiple units (see Figure 3. Sanborn Map 1930). Since the 1960s, the subject block, entirely residential in 1930, began to be transformed into commercial usage. Cottages were torn down and replaced with two-story office buildings, large apartment complexes, civic
Figure 2. 1907 Sanborn Map, showing 226, 228, 230, and 232 Anapamu Street at top of map highlighted in yellow and 1117 and 1121 Garden Street along the right side, highlighted in yellow.
buildings such as the Police Station and Superior Court/County District Attorney’s offices, and parking lots. Most remaining small cottages were remodeled as offices.

5. **CRITERIA OF SIGNIFICANCE**

To assess whether a building is significant, the City’s Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites (January 2002) establish criteria from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as well as City criteria. Under CEQA Guideline §15064.5(a) historic resources include the following:
A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.)

A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in §5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of §5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, providing the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code, or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in §5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

Under City of Santa Barbara Guidance, a significant historic resource includes but is not limited to:

1. Any structure, site or object designated on the most current version of the following lists: National Historic Landmarks, National Register of Historic Places, California Registered Historical Landmark, California Register of Historical Resources, City of Santa Barbara Landmarks, City of Santa Barbara Structures of Merit.

2. Selected structures that are representative of particular styles including vernacular as well as high styles, architectural styles that were popular fifty or more years ago, or structures that are embodiments of outstanding attention to architectural design, detail,
materials, or craftsmanship.

3. Any structure, site or object meeting any or all criteria established for a City Landmark and a City Structure of Merit (Municipal Code, Chapter 22.22.040, Ord. 3900 ¶1, 1977), as follows:

   A. Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;
   B. Its location as the site of a significant historic event;
   C. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;
   D. Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;
   E. Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;
   F. Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;
   G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;
   H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;
   I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;
   J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;
   K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation.

4. Any structure, site or object meeting any or all of the criteria provided for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Historical Landmark list, as follows:
   The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

   A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
   B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
   C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
   D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

5. Any structure, site, or object associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community at large; or illustrates the broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history.
6. Any structure, site or object that conveys an important sense of time and place, or contributes to the overall visual character of a neighborhood or district.

7. Any structure, site, or object able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to historical, historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research.

8. Any structure, site or object determined by the City to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the City’s determination is based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record [Ref. State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a)(3)].

6. INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS OF EACH BUILDING

Because the project contains eight buildings to be analyzed, for the sake of clarity, the usual layout of a Phase 1 HSSR has been modified to discuss each building separately, with the headings of architectural and social history, description, and evaluation of significance. The buildings are discussed below.
An early city map from 1878 depicts the study property as part of a larger agricultural parcel that is under cultivation. The 1889 Mensch Map, the next map in sequence, shows that the study site block was partly subdivided by this time, and that the subject property was owned
Hitching post in front of 226 East Anapamu Street. Facing south

by Rufus D. Smith. Smith, the County Under Sheriff, and family, are listed as the occupants of 226 East Anapamu in the 1888 city directory. Thus, based on available map and directory information, and a visual inspection, it seems likely that the dwelling was built in the 1880s. The house appears on the 1892 Sanborn Map, which shows the house’s core cross-gabled design, with the front wing running east and west and rear wing north and south, and a full-width front porch.

It appears as though Rufus D. Smith’s family was the first, or a very early, occupant of the study dwelling. Historical sources list Smith as the owner and occupant from 1888 until his death in 1935. During the late 1920s and early 1930s he is listed along with two lawyers, his son, James W. Smith, and Eldert A. Rizor, at the study address, indicating that part of the building may have been used as offices at this time. Rufus D. Smith came to Santa Barbara in 1876 and the following year was elected Justice of the Peace, an office he held until 1880. In 1880 he was appointed Under Sheriff of Santa Barbara County and served continuously in that post for forty-seven years.

James W. Smith began practicing law in 1896 after graduation from Hastings Law College, an occupation he followed for the next thirty years. He also served as a city councilman for ten year. Rizor was admitted to the bar in 1904 and went on to share a law office with James W. Smith. In 1908 he was appointed police court judge to fill out the prior judge’s term, and the following year he won the first of several continuous elections to the same office. Over the four decades beginning in 1940 the dwelling was occupied by: Thomas Holmes, a gardener; Clarence Huffine, a chauffeur; Noel Remy, a laundry manager; William Goodspeed, an engineer with the County Road Department; Victor Fuentes, a UCSB faculty member; and several other short-
term tenants. Clarence Huffine and his wife Jane owned the property from approximately the mid-1940s to mid-1960s. The house continued as a residence into the present time.

Description

This one-story residence has sustained numerous additions to its original 1880s core. The cross-gabled roof, with moderately- and steeply-pitched rooflines, has boxed and open eves and is clad in rolled composition roofing. Nearly all of it is sided with wood shingles, while its fenestration is a mix of wood and aluminum sash. The front-gabled porch roof is supported on four square wood supports above a shingled half wall. A shed-roof supported on a single square post runs along the left side of the front porch. Modern six-pane fixed-sash windows flank the modern hollow-core entry door with its two-pane transom.

At the southwest corner is a sun porch addition with a shed roof, a door with landing and steps facing north and two fixed, multiple-pane windows. To the rear of the sun porch is another 2/2 double-hung window, followed by a small porch, landing and stairs and a French door. Another shed-roofed addition, which is an addition to a prior addition, extends southward from the house, accommodating the southward slope of the property gradient. Together, the two additions contain aluminum-sashed windows facing west, south and east, a small wood casement and one narrow, vertically-oriented double-hung window. Portions of the additions feature vertical board siding below the windows.

Alterations

The 1907 edition of the Sanborn Map depicts a room addition to the south elevation and a new porch on the west elevation. Another expansion was made to the west elevation in 1927, according to a building permit, which consisted of a 3’ x 12’ addition to the dining room (City Building Permit #A-3351, August 29, 1927) (Nye 2014). By 1930, as revealed by the Sanborn Map from that year, additions had been made to the east and south elevations. A photograph from the 1978 Survey showed a pergola along the left side of the façade. Since 1978, further alterations were made to convert the single family house into multiple apartments. A 2012 photographs showed the replacement of the trellis on the left half of the front porch with a shed roof, the infill of the central front door and the closure of the opening in the shingled wall leading to it, the addition of a ten-pane French entry door in place of a window at the front porch, the addition of a porch and ten-pane entry door on the west elevation, and the replacement of a number of wood-framed windows with aluminum-framed windows. Today, the façade has been altered again, with a two six-pane fixed window replacing the former French entry door, the front door replaced with a modern door, and the replacement of a French door with a fixed sash window.

Significance

*Historical Integrity:* The dwelling has not retained its overall historical integrity. Although it has retained its integrity of location, it has not retained its integrity of design, materials or workmanship. The numerous additions and alterations have obscured the original core
building design, replaced original materials with inappropriate ones and disturbed most of its elements of initial workmanship. The house’s setting has also been lost as a result of the relatively recent transition to a largely commercial streetscape on the 200 block of East Anapamu Street.

1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:
   A. *Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;* The building does not possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city, as will be discussed below. The structure does not meet this criterion. However the hitching post in the front planter strip is significant under Criterion A as a rare surviving example of the type of “parking” associated with nineteenth century horse and buggy transportation.
   
   B. *Its location as the site of a significant historic event;* Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   C. *Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;* The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. Rufus D. Smith, an early justice of the peace and undersheriff in the area, is the most noteworthy individual associated with the dwelling. He is not, however, recognized in the local historical records as a person of significance to the history and development of the city. The remaining persons associated with the study property were not identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   D. *Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;* The dwelling is not an exemplary example of a particular architectural style or way of life. It appears to have originated as a vernacular dwelling that was cross-shaped, with a side-gabled wing running east-west and a rear wing running north-south. Subsequent alterations and additions, including the front-gabled porch, installation of modern doors and windows, and shingle siding have left the building with no discernable style. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   E. *Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;* The property is not the best remaining architectural type in the neighborhood as it is not representative of any architectural type, and there are no other buildings of its era remaining on the block. The structure does not meet this criterion.
F. Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation; The property’s designer and builder are not known, and the structure’s design does not indicate characteristics or quality of a significant designer. The structure does not meet this criterion.

G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship; The property does not embody elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail and craftsmanship. The dwelling features materials and techniques typical of its time and displays no high style architectural elements that were the result of outstanding craftsmanship, design or use of materials. The structure does not meet this criterion.

H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark; The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood; Although the house was built in the 1880s and is therefore an established feature of the neighborhood, its altered condition prevents it from conveying a unique appearance or a recognized architectural presence. The structure does not meet this criterion.

J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest; the property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.

K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation; The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. The property does not meet Criteria A through D of the National Register of Historic Places since it does not meet the corresponding criteria found in the City MEA. The structure does not meet this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. In addition, it is not capable of illustrating any broad patterns of history. The many significant alterations preclude the dwelling from representing any specific trends in cultural, social, political, economic or industrial history associated with Santa Barbara. The structure does not meet this criterion.

6. Due to its many alterations, the dwelling is no longer capable of conveying a sense of time and place or contributing substantially to the visual character of the neighborhood. In any case, the surrounding neighborhood has changed significantly since World War II, and now includes a strong commercial presence. The structure does not meet this criterion.
7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion. In summary, the house at 226 East Anapamu Street meets only City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but does not meet any of the other City, State, or National criteria for historical significance.

In summary, the house at 226 East Anapamu Street meets only City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but does not meet any of the other City, State, or National criteria for historical significance. The hitching post in the planter strip in front of the house is significant under Criterion A as a rare surviving example of the type of “parking” associated with nineteenth century horse and buggy transportation.
228 East Anapamu Street  *(courtesy Ronald Nye)*

North façade showing Queen Anne Free Classic style details, modern door and window alterations. Facing south.

South elevation showing modern additions. Facing north.
Architectural and Social History

The first available records of building on the property are three permits issued in 1905 to the owner, Henry G. Wilson, for three identical frame dwellings to be built on the corner lot at East Anapamu and Garden Streets. They were built by Albert P. Hardy, a local carpenter and building contractor (City of Santa Barbara, Permit Nos. 548, 549, 550, “Record of Building Permits, Vol. 1, August 1, 1902-October 30, 1920). The 1907 Sanborn Map reveals that the three cottages built in 1905 were irregularly-shaped, with each featuring a bay on their northeast corner and an adjacent partial-width porch. A wing with a small porch facing east extended southward from their southwest corners.

The first identifiable occupant of the dwelling listed in the directories was E. A. Hall, an insurance agent, in 1911. Between 1913 and the early 1920s the house was occupied by a series of individuals and their families, including a salesman, a building contractor, the manager of a newspaper office, and a draftsman. From the early 1920s until the late 1940s, Frank H. Murphy, a waiter, and wife Jane, are listed at the study site, and from 1951 through at least 1963, Jane was the sole occupant. The Murphys owned the property from at least the late 1920s to the early 1960s. Several tenants occupied the cottage over the following two decades, including a cook, a retired couple, and a real estate office. The house was converted to B-2 zoning in 1982 and has served as offices into the present time.

Description

This Queen Anne Free Classic style one-story dwelling has a hipped roof with a moderate pitch, composition shingle roofing and boxed eaves with scrolled brackets. A wide frieze band below the eaves encircles the house. It has narrow clapboard siding throughout from the window sills to the eaves, and a combination of vertical tongue and groove boards and vertical-seamed wood paneling below the windows. The facade features a partial-width porch supported by three Tuscan columns and a dominant gabled bay. It has a solid front railing covered by tongue and groove boards laid vertically and is accessed by steps with side rails covered with the same sheathing. The steps are surfaced with outdoor carpeting and the landing has modern tile flooring. The west end of the porch has been altered to provide for an ADA lift. Below the porch roof is the 10-pane French entry door, with an added vertical board side panel on its right and a wide 1/1 double-hung window. To the left of the entry door is a matching 10-pane French door facing west. The gabled bay contains a double-hung window with a large single-paned sash topped by a cross hatched sash and flanked by two 1/1 double-hung windows. A small roof gable with wood shingle siding tops the bay.

The west elevation contains six 1/1 double hung windows at the first floor level, including two sets of paired windows, and a wood-sashed sliding window and a set of paired double-hung windows at the basement level. On the south elevation, a short wing on the west end contains a 1/1 double-hung window on the first floor and a shed-roofed set of French doors with sidelights below it on the basement level. A second short wing, which is an addition, extends from the east end of the elevation, featuring on the first floor two double-hung windows. A shed-roofed porch shelters a modern door with a four-light window and an adjacent small window on the basement level. Centered between the two wings is a recessed doorway on the first floor accessed by exterior wood steps and landing that are both covered by exterior
The east elevation contains five 1/1 double-hung windows on the first floor, two of which are paired. A modern wood flush door is located on the basement level.

**Alterations**

The 228 cottage was altered in 1928 when its owner, Frank H. Murphy, took advantage of the steep downward gradient of the lot and added a basement level garage, a sleeping porch above it, and a new set of steps to the first floor of the south elevation (City Permit A4252, September 21, 1928). It is evident from a visual survey that several other alterations were made to the dwelling over the years, most likely resulting from its evolution from single family, to office, and finally to apartment use. A permit was issued in 1984 to add 403 square feet to the front portion of the building that extended the north elevation intact, including the bay, porch and steps, 7' 3” towards East Anapamu Street. An ADA lift was also installed at the west end of the porch (Nye 2014). Two additional alterations were made on the façade, probably as part of the same 1984 project: the original window to the right of the entry door was replaced with a wider one and a 1/1 double hung window was added to the north end of the east elevation. A west-facing 10-pane French door that provides additional access to the front porch from the interior of the structure was installed relatively recently and matches the 10-pane entry door, which is also modern. The end column was not installed correctly to match the existing, and should match that at 230 East Anapamu Street when the project takes place.

**Significance**

*Historical Integrity:* The dwelling has retained a moderate level of overall historical integrity. It has retained its integrity of location, and setting through its relationship with its matching house at 230 East Anapamu Street, even with its move seven feet forward. It has retained a moderate level of design, materials and workmanship integrity. Its main, or north, elevation retains many of its original Queen Anne Free Classic style characteristics and it still closely resembles its architectural match next door at 230 East Anapamu Street. Because these two separate structures appear as a cohesive unit that has a distinct rhythm with the asymmetrical plan, bay windows with intricate multi-light upper sash under a gable, narrow clapboard siding, Tuscan columns, and decorative brackets supporting widely-overhanging eaves, it retains integrity of feeling and association.

1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

   **A. Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation:** The building does possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city,
as is discussed below under items 3 D, E, G, and I, 4, 5, and 6. The structure meets this criterion.

B. *Its location as the site of a significant historic event;* Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event. The structure does not meet this criterion.

C. *Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;* The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.

D. *Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;* Even with the alterations noted above, the building is a good quality example of the Queen Anne Free Classic style. This style evolved in Santa Barbara at the turn of the twentieth century as an off-shoot of the earlier Queen Anne style merged with the Colonial Revival style. Its character-defining features include the asymmetrical plan, bay windows with intricate multi-light upper sash, narrow clapboard siding, Tuscan porch columns, and decorative brackets supporting widely-overhanging eaves. The structure meets this criterion.

E. *Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;* The property, if viewed together with its match at 230, is one of the best remaining architectural types in the neighborhood. A block away, at 1236 Garden Street, is another excellent example of a Queen Anne Free Classic house. In conjunction with 230 East Anapamu Street, the structure meets this criterion.

F. *Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;* The house was built by Albert P. Hardy, a contractor, who may have designed it as well. He is not recognized as a significant individual in the city’s history. The structure does not meet this criterion.

G. *Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;* The property embodies elements demonstrating outstanding attention to materials and craftsmanship, including the old-growth wood windows with the diamond shaped wood mullions in the top sash, the brackets and the columns. The structure meets this criterion.

H. *Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;* The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

I. *Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;* The trio of similar cottages were built in 1905 and until 1948, when 232 was completely altered, they were an established visual feature of the neighborhood. From 1948 to the present, the remaining two Queen Anne Free Classic
style houses have continued to be unique visual features that convey a sense of a bygone period of time dating to the early 1900s. This structure meets this criterion.

J. *Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;* The property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.

K. *Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation;* The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. **National Register of Historic Places criteria:** The property does not qualify for listing on the National Register because its significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. It is not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); does not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D).

**California Register of Historical Resources criteria:** For the same reasons discussed above under item 3, the property does not qualify under Criteria A, B or D, pertaining to contribution to broad patterns of history, association with significant persons, and yielding of important information. The property does not qualify under Criteria A, B or D. The property does qualify under Criterion C for its Structure of Merit level architectural characteristics embodied in its Queen Anne Free Classic style. In addition, the residence, along with its adjacent sibling cottage, is a contributor to the East Anapamu Street neighborhood streetscape. As noted above, the study property is over 50 years old and has retained a moderate level of historic integrity. The residence meets this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. The structure is, however, capable of illustrating the Queen Anne Free Classic style as a broad pattern of Santa Barbara’s architectural history. This neighborhood was developed during the later years of the American Period (1870-1900) and the early years of the Early Twentieth Century Period (1900-1925) of Santa Barbara’s history. During the American Period, Santa Barbara’s cultural and architectural identity evolved from predominantly Hispanic to an Anglo-American-infused aesthetic, and meets this criterion.

6. The dwelling, when paired with its neighbor at 230, is capable of conveying a sense of time and place. The two houses, with their small bulk, cross-hatched bay windows and round porch columns contrast with the surrounding neighborhood that portrays a modern commercial presence. Although the alterations to the building at 228 prevent it from fully conveying a sense of time and place, it nonetheless meets this criterion.

7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This
potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion.

In summary, the cottage at 228 East Anapamu Street meets City Criteria for historical significance and is eligible for listing as a Structure of Merit, pertaining to qualities significant to the heritage of the City; a good quality example of architecture; the best remaining architectural type in the neighborhood; unique visual features; architectural characteristics and contribution to the neighborhood streetscape; more than 50 years old and with a moderate level of historic integrity; and conveyance of a sense of time and place: (City Criteria 2, 3A, 3D, 3E, 3G, 3I, 4, 5, and 6).
North façade showing Queen Anne Free Classic style details. Facing south.

South elevation showing modern additions. Facing north.
**Architectural and Social History**

The first available records of building on the property are three permits issued in 1905 to the owner, Henry G. Wilson, for three identical frame dwellings to be built on the corner lot at East Anapamu and Garden Streets. They were built by Albert P. Hardy, a local carpenter and building contractor (City of Santa Barbara, Permit Nos. 548, 549, 550, “Record of Building Permits, Vol. 1, August 1, 1902-October 30, 1920). The 1907 Sanborn Map reveals that the three cottages built in 1905 were irregularly-shaped, with each featuring a bay on their northeast corner and an adjacent partial-width porch. A wing with a small porch facing east extended southward from their southwest corners.

The first documented occupant of the cottage was Earnest H. Johns, manager of the Singer Sewing Machine Company, who is listed in the city directory of 1911. Thereafter, from 1913 until the mid-1950s, numerous short-term tenants, both individuals and families, occupied the residence. These included tenants with the following occupations: window dresser; building contractor; nurse; conductor, Santa Barbara & Suburban Railway Co.; accountant; John E. Grant, stock broker and owner in early 1940s; William V. Hummel, mechanic and owner in late 1940s; and machine operator. The cottage was converted to a five-unit apartment in 1956, and retained that usage through 1981. It is now a single family residence.

**Description**

This Queen Anne Free Classic style one-story dwelling is similar in style to the house at 228 East Anapamu. The shared elements include: hipped roof with composition shingle roofing; extended enclosed eaves with scrolled corbels; wide frieze band below the eaves; partial-width porch with Tuscan columns; bay containing a centered double-hung window with a cross-hatched sash in the top; small front-facing gable over the bay; several original double-hung windows; and horizontal narrow clapboard siding above the window sills and tongue-and-groove boards laid vertically below the windows. The facade features a possibly original French entry door that has been altered by the placement of a wood panel over its lower six lights, and to its right, an original 1/1 double-hung window. The porch has a boxed-in wood railing and its landing is covered by outdoor carpeting.

The west elevation contains four 1/1 double-hung windows, including one set that is paired, and a small louvered window on the first floor. The basement level contains a single, recessed French door; two 1/1 double-hung windows; and two small aluminum sliding windows. The south elevation contains a south-extending wing with a 1/1 double-hung window and a shed-roofed addition on the first floor. A double French door with a shed roof is located on the basement level. The eastern portion of the south elevation is recessed and exhibits a French door and a 1/1 double-hung window on the first floor and set of wood stairs with wood railing that leads to the French door from the basement level. The east elevation includes five 1/1 double-hung windows, two of which are paired, and a casement window, on the first floor. The basement level exhibits four sliding sash windows, including two with wood sash and two with aluminum sash, and a wood-paneled door with a multiple-light window.
Alterations

The documentation of alterations and additions to this cottage is incomplete. Sometime prior to 1945 a one-car garage and laundry room had been added at the basement level on the south end of the building. In 1945 a permit was issued to the owners, John E. and Elizabeth Grant, to add a bathroom, relocate a window, and rebuild the exterior stairs in the same location (City of Santa Barbara, Permit No. C-516, February 19, 1945). A permit was issued in 1977 to make alterations to the existing basement. Other changes to the exterior are visible, including: the main entry door on the north elevation was altered at an unknown date when the lower six lights of an eight-light French door were covered by a wood panel; a shed-roofed addition to the first floor on the south elevation; a relatively new set of wood steps with wood railing on the south elevation; and aluminum sash sliding windows at the basement level on the east and west elevations.

Significance

_Historical Integrity:_ The dwelling has retained a moderate level of historical integrity. It has retained its integrity of location and setting through its relationship with its matching house at 228 East Anapamu Street. It has retained a moderate level of design, materials and workmanship integrity. Its main, or north, elevation retains many of its original architectural characteristics and it still closely resembles its neighbor next door at 228 East Anapamu Street. Because these two separate structures appear as a cohesive unit that has a distinct rhythm with the asymmetrical plan, bay windows with intricate multi-light upper sash under a gable, narrow clapboard siding, Tuscan columns, and decorative brackets supporting widely-overhanging eaves, it retains integrity of feeling and association.

1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

   A. **Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation:** The building does possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city, as is discussed below, under items 3A, 3D, 3E, 3G, 3I, 4, 5, and 6. The structure meets this criterion.

   B. **Its location as the site of a significant historic event:** Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   C. **Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation:** The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons
associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.

**D. Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;** The building is a good quality example of the Queen Anne Free Classic style.

Even with the alterations noted above, the building is a good quality example of the Queen Anne Free Classic style. This style evolved in Santa Barbara at the turn of the twentieth century as an offshoot of the earlier Queen Anne style merged with the Colonial Revival style. Its character-defining features include the asymmetrical plan, bay windows with intricate multi-light upper sash, narrow clapboard siding, Tuscan columns, and decorative brackets supporting widely-overhanging eaves. The structure meets this criterion.

**E. Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;** The property, if viewed together with its match at 228 East Anapamu Street, is one of the best remaining architectural types in the neighborhood. A block away, at 1236 Garden Street, is another excellent example of a Queen Anne Free Classic house. In conjunction with 230 East Anapamu Street, the structure meets this criterion.

**F. Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;** The house was built by Albert P. Hardy, a contractor, who may have designed it as well. He is not recognized a significant individual in the city’s history. The structure does not meet this criterion.

**G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;** The property embodies elements demonstrating outstanding attention to materials and craftsmanship, including the old-growth wood windows with the diamond shaped wood mullions in the top sash, the brackets and the columns. The structure meets this criterion.

**H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;** The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

**I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;** The three cottages were built in 1905 and until 1948, when 232 was completely altered, they were an established visual feature of the neighborhood. From 1948 to the present the remaining two triplets have continued to be unique visual features that convey a sense of a bygone period of time dating to the early 1900s. Due to its modest design qualities and alterations the structure meets this criterion at the Structure of Merit level.
J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest; The property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.

K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation; The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. National Register of Historic Places criteria: The property does not qualify for listing on the National Register because its significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. It is not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); does not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D).

California Register of Historical Resources criteria: For the same reasons discussed above under item 3, the property does not qualify under Criteria A, B or D, pertaining to contribution to broad patterns of history, association with significant persons, and yielding of important information. The property does qualify under Criterion C for its Structure of Merit level architectural characteristics embodied in its Queen Anne Free Classic style. In addition, the residence, along with its adjacent cottage at 228, is a contributor to the East Anapamu Street neighborhood streetscape. As noted above, the study property is over 50 years old and has retained a moderate level of historic integrity. The residence meets this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. The structure is, however, capable of illustrating the Queen Anne Free Classic style as a broad pattern of Santa Barbara’s architectural history. This neighborhood was developed during the later years of the American Period (1870-1900) and the early years of the Early Twentieth Century Period (1900-1925) of Santa Barbara’s history. During the American Period, Santa Barbara’s cultural and architectural identity evolved from predominantly Hispanic to an Anglo-American-infused aesthetic, and meets this criterion.

6. The dwelling, when paired with its neighbor at 228, is capable of conveying a certain sense of time and place. The two older houses, with their small bulk, cross-hatched bay windows and round porch columns contrast with the surrounding neighborhood that portrays a modern commercial presence. Although the alterations to the study building prevents it from fully conveying a sense of time and place it nonetheless meets this criterion.

7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion.
In summary, the cottage at 230 East Anapamu Street meets City Criteria for historical significance and is eligible for listing as a Structure of Merit, pertaining to qualities significant to the heritage of the City; a good quality example of architecture; the best remaining architectural type in the neighborhood; unique visual features; architectural characteristics and contribution to the neighborhood streetscape; more than 50 years old and with a moderate level of historic integrity; and conveyance of a sense of time and place: (City Criteria 2, 3A, 3D, 3E, 3G, 3I, 4, 5, and 6).
North façade showing alteration of the Queen Anne to a Spanish Colonial Revival style. Facing southwest.

South and east elevations. Facing northeast.
Hitching posts in front of 232 East Anapamu Street. Facing south.

Architectural and Social History

The first available records of building on the property are three permits issued in 1905 to the owner, Henry G. Wilson, for three identical frame dwellings to be built on the corner lot at East Anapamu and Garden Streets. They were built by Albert P. Hardy, a local carpenter and building contractor (City of Santa Barbara, Permit Nos. 548, 549, 550, “Record of Building Permits, Vol. 1, August 1, 1902-October 30, 1920). The 1907 Sanborn Map reveals that the three cottages built in 1905 were irregularly-shaped, with each featuring a bay on their northeast corner and an adjacent partial-width porch. A wing with a small porch facing east extended southward from their southwest corners.

The first occupant listed at 232 is Francis M. Fultz, the superintendent of city schools, who is named in the 1911 city directory. Fultz was followed by alternating years of vacancy and three short-term occupants: a pharmacy clerk; a photographer; and a farm advisor. Alexander Clement, a mechanic, and his wife Margaret, are listed as owners and occupants for the approximate years 1927-1936. Roy G. Moore, a chiropractor, owned and practiced in the cottage, from 1948 to 1974. The attorney Tomas A. Castelo acquired the building in about 1977 and named his office the Anapamu Professional Center. He is the present owner and an occupant of the building.
Description

The corner building was originally a Queen Anne Free Classic cottage which was a replica of the two houses at 228 and 230. In 1948 it was transformed into a Spanish Colonial Revival building. The one remaining stylistic element to indicate its origins is its widely overhanging eaves with scrolled rafters. The building has a one-story hipped roof entry bay with a canted entrance with a wood paneled door, red brick-paved stoop and matching steps. It becomes two-story at the rear where the ground slopes, with the rear section set back from the front section. The walls are clad in stucco and the roof is covered with composition shingles. A red tile shed-roof porch extends from the east elevation. The steel casement windows are three- or four-paned, with some inset in a larger fixed multi-pane frame. Some are flanked by decorative wood shutters.

Alterations

The most significant alteration to this property occurred in 1948, when the owner, Roy G. Moore, converted the single-family dwelling into a chiropractor’s office and added residential units in the rear. The north façade was extended ten feet towards East Anapamu Street, which resulted in the removal of the original porch, bay window, and front-facing gable and their replacement with a hipped roof and a new, canted entrance at the northeast corner with a wood paneled door, red brick-paved stoop and matching steps. The cottage was re-roofed with composition shingles and clay tile-capped ridges, and new stucco siding was applied to its walls. New steel casement windows, a few with faux wood shutters, were installed throughout the building. The two-story apartment addition on the rear included a clay tile-roofed porch facing Garden Street and other architectural elements that replicated those of the altered original building (City building permit, No. D-1038, April 5, 1948, and architectural drawings, “Remodel of Residence into Professional Office for Dr. Roy Moore,” c. 1948). A fire occurred in the building in 1959 causing damage mainly to interior areas of the office and basement. The front door and glazing on six windows required replacement (City building permit No. 5413, August 24, 1959).

More recent alterations include the basement level wall openings: one triple and one single aluminum-sash sliding window with wood framing on the east elevation; two vinyl-clad multiple-light windows, one with a double-hung sash and one with a sliding sash, one aluminum sliding-sash window, and two wood hollow core doors on the west elevation.

Significance

Historical Integrity: The dwelling has not retained its overall historical integrity. It has retained its integrity of location but its integrity of setting has been diminished because the city block now contains mostly commercial and governmental structures. It has not retained its integrity of design, materials and workmanship. The former original Queen Anne Free Classic style cottage was transformed in 1948 to a simple Spanish Colonial Revival style office building. This resulted in a complete overhaul of the original cottage’s front façade, wall cladding, window types and sizes, ornamentation, and orientation to East Anapamu Street.
1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

   A. *Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;* The building does not possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city, as will be discussed below. The structure does not meet this criterion. However the hitching posts in the front planter strip are significant as a rare surviving example of the type of “parking” associated with nineteenth century horse and buggy transportation.

   B. *Its location as the site of a significant historic event;* Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   C. *Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;* The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   D. *Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;* The building after its alterations in 1948, was transformed into a simple Spanish Colonial Revival building. The structure is thus not an exemplary example of this architectural style and does not meet this criterion.

   E. *Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;* The property is not the best remaining architectural type on the 200 block of East Anapamu Street because of its extensive alterations and additions. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   F. *Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;* The original house was built in 1905 by Albert P. Hardy, a contractor, who may have designed it as well. He is not recognized as a significant individual in the city’s history. The architect of the structure’s makeover in 1948 was Vernon W. Behel, Jr., a designer who worked in Santa Barbara during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Behel is not recognized as a significant contributor to local history or culture. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   G. *Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;* The property does not embody elements
demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail and craftsmanship. The dwelling features materials and techniques typical of its time and displays no high style architectural elements that were the result of outstanding craftsmanship, design or use of materials. The structure does not meet this criterion.

H. *Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;* The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

I. *Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;* The three cottages were built in 1905 and until 1948, when 232 was completely altered, they were an established visual feature of the neighborhood. Although the remaining two cottages at 228 and 230 have continued to be unique visual features that convey a sense of a bygone period of time dating to the early 1900s, the Spanish Colonial Revival style building represented by 232 does not qualify as a unique or established visual feature. The structure does not meet this criterion.

J. *Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;* The property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.

K. *Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation;* The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. *National Register of Historic Places criteria:* The property does not qualify for listing on the National Register because its significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. It is not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); does not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D).

*California Register of Historical Resources criteria:* For the same reasons discussed above, the property does not qualify under Criteria A, B, C, or D. The property does not qualify under Criterion C due to its Minimal Traditional Spanish Colonial Revival Style architectural characteristics that date to 1948. As noted above, the study property is over 50 years old but has not retained its historical integrity. The structure does not meet this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. Likewise, due to its altered condition, it is not capable of illustrating a broad pattern in Santa Barbara history. The structure does not meet this criterion.

6. The former Queen Anne Free Classic style dwelling, now a Spanish Colonial Revival style office and apartment building that is not compatible with its former cottages at 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street, is not capable of conveying an important sense of time and place
dating to an earlier era or of contributing to the visual character of the neighborhood. The structure does not meet this criterion.

7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion.

In summary, the former cottage at 232 East Anapamu Street meets only City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but does not meet any of the other City, State, or National criteria for historical significance. The hitching posts in the front planter strip are significant as a rare surviving example of the type of “parking” associated with nineteenth century horse and buggy transportation.
1117 Garden Street

East façade showing replacement filigree columns. Facing west.

North elevation showing addition and modern metal siding. Facing southwest.
Architectural and Social History

The three buildings at 1117, 1119, and 1121 were identical vernacular one-story cottages, constructed c. 1905 (Anderle 1978). They appear on the Sanborn Map of 1907, with 1119 and 1121 shown on a single parcel. The house at 1117 appears in the City Directories from 1917 on as owned by H. F. Hummel, manager of the American Cloak Company at 9 West Ortega Street. Mr. Hummel continued to be listed in the Directories in 1945. By the 1950s, the house was occupied by Chris Langskov, a barber, then Walter Mongue, retired, and A. G. Helmer, a manager at a Safeway store. By 1960 the buildings at the rear had been added, and were occupied by Raymond Jones, a salesman, and Dorothy Lankin, a secretary. It continues to serve as a multi-unit apartment building.

Description

The cottage is one-story along Garden Street, rising to two-stories at the rear where the ground slopes. The gabled roof, clad in composition shingles, is mimicked with a small central gabled porch roof supported on decorative scrolled metal posts. Wood-framed bay windows with one-over-one double hung panes flank the central hollow core front door, which is reached via a raised porch of concrete and brick. A third bay window extends from the south elevation. Along the south side, the basement level has a bank of aluminum-framed single pane windows. The front house has been covered with metal siding in a wide clapboard pattern, with metal imitation board and batten siding on the basement level. The rear portion of the house is two-story, with narrow wood clapboard siding. The double-hung windows are of varying sizes, in wood-frame surrounds with decorative flared lintels. A wood-framed flight of stairs leads to a second floor entrance on the west elevation, of wood with an upper glass pane.
Alterations

This c.1905 cottage was altered in 1931 with a two-story addition and garage at the rear which made the single-family home into a duplex (City building permit A-7124, November 30, 1931). In modern times it has been altered with the addition of metal clapboard and board and batten siding on the front portion, the replacement of the Tuscan columns with scrolled metal posts, and the modernization of the north elevation of the rear apartments with louvered windows in the basement level, and aluminum-framed windows, a hollow-core door, a hollow-core door with a glass upper pane, and a sliding glass aluminum-framed door on the first floor. On the southwest corner is a two-story T1-11-sided wall.

Significance

_Historical integrity:_ The dwelling has not retained its overall historical integrity. Although it has retained integrity of location and setting, as one of three c. 1905 cottages along Garden Street, it has not retained its integrity of design, materials or workmanship. The numerous additions and alterations have obscured the original design, replaced original materials with modern ones, and removed its elements of initial workmanship. As a result it no longer conveys feeling and association with its 1905 origins. Although the rhythm of the streetscape remains, which is echoed in the similar setbacks of 1171, 1119 and 1121, and which conveys the feeling of its 1905 origins, because of its alterations of materials and design, it no longer retains the requisite integrity to be considered significant.

1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

   A. _Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;_ The building does not possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city, as will be discussed below. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   B. _Its location as the site of a significant historic event; Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event._ The structure does not meet this criterion.

   C. _Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;_ The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.
D. Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation; The building, because of its alterations does not represent the vernacular style as it was originally constructed. This c.1905 cottage was altered in 1931 with a two-story addition and garage at the rear which made the single-family home into a duplex (City building permit A-7124, November 30, 1931). In modern times it has been altered with the addition of metal clapboard and board and batten siding on the front portion, the replacement of the Tuscan columns with scrolled metal posts, and the modernization of the north elevation of the rear apartments with louvered windows in the basement level, and aluminum-framed windows, a hollow-core door, a hollow-core door with a glass upper pane, and a sliding glass aluminum-framed door on the first floor. On the southwest corner is a two-story T1-11 sided wall. The structure does not meet this criterion.

E. Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood; The property is not the best remaining architectural type on the 1100 block of Garden Street because of its extensive alterations and additions. The structure does not meet this criterion.

F. Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation; The original architect or contractor is unknown, and the structure’s design does not indicate characteristics or quality of a significant designer. The structure does not meet this criterion.

G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship; The property does not embody elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail and craftsmanship. The dwelling features materials and techniques typical of its time and displays no high style architectural elements that were the result of outstanding craftsmanship, design or use of materials. The structure does not meet this criterion.

H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark; The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood; 1117 as well as its similar two cottages at 1119 and 1121 were built in 1905 and until their alterations in modern times were an established visual feature of the neighborhood. Because of its alterations, the building no longer conveys a sense of a bygone period of time dating to the early 1900s. The structure does not meet this criterion.

J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest; The property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.
K. *Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation.* The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the well-being of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. *National Register of Historic Places criteria:* The property does not qualify for listing on the National Register because its significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. It is not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); does not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D).

*California Register of Historical Resources criteria:* For the same reasons discussed above, the property does not qualify under Criteria A, B, C, or D. As noted above, the study property is over 50 years old but has not retained its historical integrity. The structure does not meet this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. Likewise, due to its altered condition, it is not capable of illustrating a broad pattern in Santa Barbara history. The structure does not meet this criterion.

6. The former vernacular cottage, because of its extensive alterations, is not capable of conveying an important sense of time and place dating to an earlier era or of contributing to the visual character of the neighborhood. The structure does not meet this criterion.

7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion.

In summary, the cottage at 1117 Garden Street meets only City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but does not meet any of the other City, State, or National criteria for historical significance.
1121 Garden Street

East façade showing Tuscan columns. Facing west.

West and north elevations showing modern alterations. Facing southeast.
Architectural and Social History

The three buildings at 1117, 1119, and 1121 were identical vernacular one-story cottages, constructed c. 1905 (Anderle 1978). They appear on the Sanborn Map of 1907, with 1119 and 1121 shown on a single parcel. The house at 1121 appears in the City Directories from 1917 on as rented by a widow, Mrs. H. L. Harsh. In 1928-31, it was rented by another widow, Mrs. A. B. Hart. In 1934, it was rented by A. B. Garman, followed in 1954 by Anna Steinweiden, a widow, by Ira Clodfelter, retired, in 1964, and George Madueno, a TB researcher, in 1974. It continues to serve as a residential rental.

Description

The one-story cottage with wood shingle siding has a gabled roof, clad in composition shingles, which is mimicked with a small central gabled porch roof supported by a pair of Tuscan columns. Wood-framed bay windows with one-over-one double hung panes flank the central wood door with six recessed panels, which is reached via a raised porch of concrete and brick. A third bay window extends from the south elevation. The concrete foundation is topped by T1-11 siding with louvered windows in the basement. A stucco-sided shed roof garage, built after 1930, sits at the rear of the property.

Alterations

The foundation was replaced with concrete siding in 1980 (City permit 2493, April 9, 1980). A
modern addition was added at the rear, consisting of a flat-roof room with T1-11 plywood siding, a porch with square posts, and aluminum-framed windows.

Significance

**Historical Integrity:** The dwelling has retained integrity of location and setting, as one of three c. 1905 vernacular cottages along Garden Street, and integrity of design and materials on the façade facing Garden Street, with its original shingle siding, Tuscan columns, and bay windows.

1. The building is not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but is located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. The structure does not meet this criterion.

2. The building is over 50 years old and thus meets the 50 year old requirement. See below under Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria for a discussion of the building’s historical and architectural qualifications. The structure meets this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

   A. **Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;** The building does not possess qualities that are significant to the heritage of the city, as will be discussed below. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   B. **Its location as the site of a significant historic event;** Historical research has shown that it is not the site of a significant historical event. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   C. **Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;** The building is not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   D. **Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State, or the Nation;** The building, although retaining its integrity of design and materials on the façade, is not a particularly good example of a vernacular style building, without unusual detailing. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   E. **Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;** The property is not the best remaining architectural type on the 1100 block of Garden Street. It is a typical example of a vernacular style building, without unusual detailing. The structure does not meet this criterion.

   F. **Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;** The original architect or contractor is unknown, and the structure’s design does not indicate
characteristics or quality of a significant designer. The structure does not meet this criterion.

G. *Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship*; The property does not embody elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail and craftsmanship. The dwelling features materials and techniques typical of its time and displays no high style architectural elements that were the result of outstanding craftsmanship, design or use of materials. The structure does not meet this criterion.

H. *Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark*; The property is not essential to the integrity of another landmark because it is not associated with any nearby landmark. The structure does not meet this criterion.

I. *Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood*; 1117 Garden Street as well as the similar two cottages at 1119 and 1121 Garden Street were built in 1905, and until the alterations in modern times to 1117 and 1119, they were an established visual feature of the neighborhood. Their singular physical characteristic lay in their presence as a series of three adjacent identical buildings. The alteration of the two cottages at 1117 and 1119 Garden Street removed this attribute. The structure does not meet this criterion.

J. *Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest*; The property’s potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The structure does not meet this criterion.

K. *Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation*; The property is not considered a natural environment, and therefore does not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. The structure does not meet this criterion.

4. National Register of Historic Places criteria: The property does not qualify for listing on the National Register because its significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. It is not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); does not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D). California Register of Historical Resources criteria: For the same reasons discussed above, the property does not qualify under Criteria A, B, C, or D. As noted above, the study property is over 50 years old but has not retained its historical integrity. The structure does not meet this criterion.

5. Research has shown that the property is not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. Likewise, due to its altered condition, it is not capable of illustrating a broad pattern in Santa Barbara history. The structure does not meet this criterion.
6. The former vernacular cottage, because of its extensive alterations, is not capable of conveying an important sense of time and place dating to an earlier era or of contributing to the visual character of the neighborhood. The structure does not meet this criterion.

7. This assessment uncovered no information indicating that the building has the ability to yield important information to the community or to scholars in the fields of history (beyond what is already known), historic archaeology, ethnography, folklore or geography. This potential lies beyond the scope of this assessment. The structure does not meet this criterion.

8. The property is not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. The structure does not meet this criterion.

In summary, the cottage at 1121 Garden Street meets only City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but does not meet any of the other City, State, or National criteria for historical significance.
223A-H East Figueroa Street

Significance summary of the vernacular worker cottages at 223 East Figueroa Street:

Cottages 223 C, 223E, 223G, 223H, meet City Criterion 2 for being over 50 years of age, but because of their alterations and loss of historic integrity are not considered significant. (As per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, “The integrity of the property in its current condition, rather than its likely condition after a proposed treatment, should be evaluated. Factors such as structural problems, deterioration, or abandonment should be considered in the evaluation only if they have affected the integrity of the significant features or characteristics of the property”). They are not considered historic resources for CEQA review and are not considered eligible to be designated Structures of Merit. Cottages A, B, D and F retain historic integrity and are considered eligible to be designated Structures of Merit.

As well, in my professional opinion, the cottages are not considered significant as a bungalow court. According to the research provided by Nicole Hernandez, City of Santa Barbara Urban Historian, “a bungalow court is a style of multi-family housing which features several small houses arranged around a central communal space. To be clear, “bungalow” means small dwelling, not an architectural style. The bungalow court was created in Pasadena, California in 1909 and provided a form of multi-family housing in Southern California from the 1910s through the 1930s. Throughout Southern California the central communal spaces have been designed in a variety of methods, as communal gardens, lawns, pedestrian paths and as driveways to garages in the rear. The homes in bungalow courts were generally small, low-rise houses in the spirit of bungalow design; however, the homes were designed in a variety of architectural styles, including Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival. Bungalow courts also integrated their courtyards with the homes, providing green space to homeowners. The bungalow courts provided an ambiance and quality of living that is rare to find.

Bungalow courts were generally marketed to people who wanted the amenities of a single-family home without its high cost, most bungalow courts provided rental housing to the working class, young single people or seniors. The bungalow courts were more like single-family than multi-family houses, offering private entrances, yards, and built-ins. Santa Barbara has only just over fifteen intact, original, bungalow courts and they are considered rare and important to the heritage of the City.” (courtesy Nicole Hernandez).

Of the 15 bungalow courts listed on the City’s Potential Historic Resource List, two Craftsman bungalow courts were studied to see how they compared to the cottage court at 223 East Figueroa Street, Casalino Court and Lincoln Court, reviewed below.

617-623 De La Vina Street. Casalino Court. This complex consists of 16 cottages arranged on either side of a wide driveway which leads to a carport at the rear. The two houses on De la Vina Street are oriented to the street, while those within the court have entrances oriented to the driveway. These cottages are all of the same design, with a gable front, overhanging eaves, some with knee braces, a cutaway corner porch, and picture windows. The driveway is spacious with the houses set back evenly from it with foundation planting.
Built in three stages between 1917 and 1931, the houses are similar in design and provide a rhythm along the driveway. According to a city DPR form, “this court is eligible as a Structure of Merit: The Craftsman style court is one of four that are known of in the City of Santa Barbara. The court appears to be unaltered and in good condition. As such, the court does retain integrity of location, setting, feeling, design, materials, workmanship, and association. Therefore, the Casalino Court does appear to meet the requirements for listing as a Structure of Merit for the City of Santa Barbara under the following criteria: 3d, its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City; 3h, its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark (West Downtown De la Vina Street Historic District); and 6, any structure, site, or object that conveys an important sense of time and place, or contributes to the overall visual character of a neighborhood or district.” (Morlet 2011).
View down driveway showing symmetrical layout of the cottages. Facing west.

623A De La Vina Street showing typical cottage design. Facing north.

116 West Ortega Street, Lincoln Court. This complex consists of 13 cottages: two facing West Ortega Street, five cottages on either side of a wide walkway, and a single cottage, 118, at the
rear. Designed in the Craftsman style, the two facing West Ortega Street have side-gabled roofs with cross-gabled front porches with battered wood porch supports on sandstone piers, and concrete porch floor and steps. The cottages have clapboard siding, and the gables have shingle siding.

The ten cottages lining the central walkway are simpler, with clapboard siding, gable-front roofs with widely overhanging eaves supported on knee braces, smaller gable-front porches with concrete flooring and steps, and wood support posts and square wood railings.

Built in 1916 and 1920-25, by Roy G. Stern for the owner George F. Stern, the houses are similar in design and provide a rhythm along the walkway. The court is not on the City’s list of identified bungalow courts nor is it on the Potentials List. It was surveyed by Aubrie Morlet in 2011 for the City of Santa Barbara West Downtown Historic Building Survey, who considered the property not a contributing member to a potential De La Vina Street Historic District because its alteration of windows and doors and its derelict condition diminished its integrity of setting, feeling, materials, and workmanship (Morlet 2011).

116 West Ortega Street showing Craftsman details and sandstone porch pillars. Facing northwest.
View down walkway showing symmetrical layout of the cottages. Facing north.

View showing typical cottage design. Facing northwest.

From the above review of these two Craftsman bungalow courts built around the same time as the motor court at 223 East Figueroa Street, it is appropriate to list the character-defining
features of these bungalow courts and to compare them to the motor court at 223 East Figueroa Street.

1. Designed as one project by a single architect or designer specifically to have all the bungalows relate to one another in style, with similar design features guiding the eye through the open central court, which is public space, allowing a view of all the cohesive buildings so it is one significant development or project.

2. At street level, on a flat lot, to be visible from the sidewalk. (Judging from the Pasadena examples and those I reviewed and viewed in Santa Barbara, it is my professional opinion that the visibility of all the bungalows from the central space and from the street public-right-of-way was a strong design criterion when the original architects or designers laid out the cottages and landscaping).

3. Similar architectural style of all the buildings, arranged in a symmetrical fashion around a central driveway or walkway

4. Rentals with a single owner rather than individually owned cottages

Analysis of the character-defining features of the collection of bungalows:

1. Designed as one project by a single architect or designer specifically to have all the bungalows relate to one another in style, with similar design features guiding the eye through the open central court, which is public space, allowing a view of all the cohesive buildings so it is one significant development or project.

223 East Figueroa had two individuals laying out the plan, Mrs. Wilhoit in 1916 and Jack Hayden in 1925. The two layouts differed in symmetry and were not linked by a common design or layout. The rear property at 223 East Figueroa Street was owned by Mrs. M. S. Wilhoit, who in 1916 contracted with Sullivan Brothers to construct four houses at the back of the deep lot behind a two-story 1880s Victorian house which fronted on East Figueroa Street (see 1907 Sanborn Map below). Presumably there was a driveway along the western edge of the property fronting East Figueroa Street that provided access to the four rear cottages. In fact, Mrs. Wilhoit’s plan was not meant for a public viewing as it was designed behind a large house. The four Hayden bungalows of 1925 were designed with the similar design elements, in fact the front two are identical and they have similar design features that relate to one-another from the central motor drive, giving the 1925 portion of the court a significant spatial relationship that is lost as you reach the Wilhoit cottages.
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These first four cottages built in 1916 were arranged randomly, with what are now E and F spaced close to the east and west edges of the property and G and H closer together, larger, and divided into duplexes, with G labeled G and H and H labeled as I and J (see 1930 Sanborn Map below). They were vernacular in design with no architectural cohesion from cottage to cottage other than being small wood buildings.

In 1925 a new owner Jack Hayden bought the property; either the Victorian house had been demolished or he tore it down, for he added four more cottages at the front of the lot, arranged symmetrically, with a large expanse between the two front and two rear cottages. These four cottages had no symmetrical connection to the four cottages at the rear except to be on the same large lot. The driveway no doubt was added down the center at this time; because of the peculiar layout of cottages G and H, the central driveway had to jog to continue on to the rear of the lot. Mr. Hayden did not live at the property and presumably was building the cottages as rentals. In 1927 a new owner, A. C. Zvolanek, added two three-car garages at the rear.
View up driveway showing the jog in the concrete pavers to accommodate the narrow placement of cottages G and H. Facing north.
1930 Sanborn Map showing the random arrangement of the eight cottages built in 1916 (top) and 1925 (bottom)

2. At street level, on a flat lot, to be visible from the sidewalk. The cottage court at 223 East Figueroa Street is not visible from the sidewalk, as the driveway is sloped and does not allow a view of the court from the sidewalk. Only the two dominant cottages set above the sandstone wall are visible from the streetscape.
Similar architectural style of all the buildings, arranged in a symmetrical fashion around a central driveway or walkway.

Because the court was laid out in two separate times, there is not a symmetry of plan, and the buildings, with the exception of 223A and 223B, are not identical. In particular, the rear four cottages are quite asymmetrical arranged, with random setbacks from the east and west property lines, as shown in the 1930 Sanborn Map, unlike the front four which are symmetrically organized, so the court lacks a spatial unity. The rear four 1916 cottages do not have the symmetrical spatial relationship to the driveway as do the front four 1925 cottages.

The vernacular style of the 1916 cottages included hipped roofs, clapboard siding, and randomly-placed windows, but over time their alterations have removed any sense of a style commonality. Building E has a rear addition and aluminum-framed windows. Building F has an added brick chimney and a bay window. Building G has an added front deck and altered windows. Building H has an added porch and picture window.

The four 1925 vernacular cottages have gable roofs, clapboard siding, entrances facing East Figueroa Street, and vertically oriented paired double-hung windows. They display a similar single and paired window pattern along the driveway, and no doubt were identical when built. However, with the stated exception of cottages A and B fronting East Figueroa Street, the other two cottages have been sufficiently altered that they no longer are identical in style. Building C has an overscale front porch and dormer window, and Building D has an enclosed front porch and large dormer window.
4. **Rentals rather than individually owned.** The cottages originally were constructed by two separate owners, and used as rental units, but after 1945 and 1948 the lots were subdivided and individually owned. From the first alteration, to cottage D in 1949, there were various alterations to individual cottages by individual owners, leading to a variety of styles within the court that resulted in a lack of cohesiveness that likely would have been retained with higher integrity had it remained under one owner. (This criterion does not represent an evaluation of significance, but is analyzed as part of what in my professional opinion determines the presence or absence of a “bungalow court”).

**Summary**

As was defined above, unlike the Pasadena courts and those in Santa Barbara on De La Vina and West Ortega Streets, this cottage complex was not designed as a single unit with a single architectural style, but as an economic response to the influx of people into the town from 1910-1930. As a cultural unit, the grouping of eight small cottages on a single lot where a large Victorian house formerly stood, is representative of Santa Barbara’s answer to the need for additional housing. As such the cottage complex is a cultural relic, with eight separate houses, rather than an aesthetic statement within the streetscape. The cottage complex as a whole does not have integrity of design, because of its alterations to individual cottages, or spatial relations, because of its construction at two different times which resulted in two different lay outs. Therefore the cottages are not considered significant as a bungalow court. As a result of this analysis, it is my professional opinion that the cottage complex does not constitute a bungalow court.
court and is not significant as such. Four individual cottages, A, B, D, and F, however retain integrity of design, materials, and workmanship and are significant as eligible for listing as Structures of Merit.
223G East Figueroa Street

Façade and east elevation showing modern plywood porch and metal security gate on door. Facing northwest.

East elevation showing replacement windows on east and north elevations. Facing south.
Architectural and Social History

223G was part of a four cottage creation with two duplex cottages labeled 223 G and H (now G) and, I and J (now H) constructed in 1916 for Mrs. M. S. Wilhoit by the Sullivan Brothers at the rear of the lot (Building permit logs, Anderle 1978). (See Figure 3. 1930 Sanborn Map). These cottages do not appear in the City Directories until 1928, at which time all the cottages were rented with the exception of 222H and 223J. They were rented to those with occupations listed as butler, chauffeur, carpenter, laborer, teacher, stenographer, nurse, driver for Union Oil, dress-maker, clerk, waiter, driller at Ellwood, bookkeeper, salesman, custodian, retired (City Directories 1916-7-1974).

Description

This small rectangular cottage, built in 1916, is sided in wide wood clapboards and has a hipped roof clad in composition shingles. The raised foundation is clad in beveled tongue and groove siding laid horizontally. A raised front porch, up three concrete steps, and sided with a wood picket railing, leads to the front door of wood with an upper glass pane. Windows in flat wood surrounds with flared lintels have varying configurations including one-over-one double-hung, casement, and sliding.

Alterations

A concrete foundation was added in 1982. At some unknown time a vertical window on the east elevation was turned to be oriented horizontally as a slider, and two casement windows were added at the east and north elevations. A modern plywood porch was added at an unknown time. A metal security gate was added over the front door. A three-car corrugated-metal sided garage associated with this cottage, as evidenced in a 1927 building permit, has been replaced at some time with a three-unit shed-roof T1-11 plywood storage shed with three plywood double doors.

Significance

Historic integrity

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, has been altered with the addition of casement windows on the east and north elevations, the change of a double-hung window oriented vertically to be oriented horizontally on the east elevation, and the addition of a modern plywood porch at the entrance. As a result, although it retains integrity of location and setting, it no longer retains integrity of materials, design, workmanship, feeling or association, and cannot convey its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1916. It therefore is not considered significant.
223H East Figueroa Street

223H East Figueroa Street, façade and west elevation with added porch, modern picture window and vinyl window. Facing northeast.

Architectural and Social History

223H was part of a four cottage creation with two duplex cottages labeled 223 G and H (now G) and, I and J (now H) constructed in 1916 by the Sullivan Brothers at the rear of the lot (Building permit logs, Anderle 1978). These cottages do not appear in the City Directories until 1928, at which time all the cottages were rented with the exception of 222H and 223J. They were rented to those with occupations listed as butler, chauffeur, carpenter, laborer, teacher, stenographer, nurse, driver for Union Oil, dress-maker, clerk, waiter, driller at Ellwood, bookkeeper, salesman, custodian, retired (City Directories 1916-7- 1974).

Description

This small rectangular cottage, built in 1916, is sided in wide wood clapboards and has a hipped roof clad in composition shingles. The foundation is covered in narrow wood siding arranged vertically. A shed-roof porch with a modern lattice screen extends from the façade. Three large, fixed, picture windows on the east, west and south elevations have wide wood surrounds. The house has a vinyl slider window facing the court. west and south elevations have wide wood surrounds. The front door has lower wood panels topped by a single pane glass.
Alterations

This vernacular cottage has been altered with a 173 square foot shed-roof addition on the facade, which includes the porch with a modern lattice screen. The picture windows on the west elevation and facade are later additions. Some of the original windows have been replaced with aluminum-framed windows, and a vinyl slider window was added facing the courtyard. A three-car corrugated metal sided garage associated with this cottage, as evidenced in a 1927 building permit, was demolished in 1980 and was replaced at an unknown date with a three-unit shed-roof T1-11 plywood storage shed with three plywood double doors.

Significance

Historic integrity

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, has been altered at an unknown date with a 173 square foot shed-roof addition on the facade, with picture windows on the facade and the east elevation and an entrance porch with a modern lattice screen. At some time a picture window was added on the west elevation. Some of the original windows have been replaced with aluminum-framed windows. Because of these incompatible alterations, although it retains integrity of location and setting, it no longer retains integrity of materials, design, workmanship, feeling or association, and cannot convey its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1916. It therefore is not considered significant.

223G, H, two storage buildings significance analysis

1. The cottages are not listed on the City’s lists of Potential Historic Structures, Designated City Landmarks, or Structures of Merit, but are located within the City’s El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District. They do not meet this criterion.

2. The buildings are over 50 years old and thus meet the 50 year old requirement. They meet this criterion.

3. Landmark and Structure of Merit Criteria:

A. Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation; These two cottages are part of a vernacular cottage complex, set behind sandstone retaining walls and bisected by a narrow driveway. The complex consists of eight cottages with two storage buildings at the rear. According to the building permits, the four cottages at the rear, E, F, G, and H, were constructed in 1916 for Mrs. M. S. Wilhoit by the Sullivan Brothers. In 1925, owner Jack Hayden added the four cottages A, B, C, and D at the front of the property. In 1927, owner Anton C. Zvolanek added the two 18’ x 27” three-car garages at the rear of the property, which have since been demolished and replaced with modern sheds.

Although different in design, with the exception of A and B which are mirror images, these vernacular cottages have a few common unifying materials and architectural features, such as clapboard siding (with the exception of cottage E, which has beveled
tongue and groove siding), and wood sash windows with flared lintels. The four oldest cottages at the rear have hipped roofs, while those built in 1925 have gable roofs.

The homes in this cottage complex are significant under Criterion A as representative of the type of modest worker housing popular in Santa Barbara between 1910 and 1930 when the population grew rapidly, and many existing single family homes were converted into flats or furnished rooms, or were replaced with multiple houses on a single lot. Cottages A, B, D, and F retain integrity of design and materials and are eligible to be designated Structures of Merit within this cottage complex. Cottages C, E, G and H no longer retain integrity of materials and design and are not considered significant individually. The storage units are modern and are not significant.

The character-defining features of this cottage complex are the layout of the center driveway, the visual rhythms of the cottages with the orientation of their entrances south towards East Figueroa Street, and the sandstone retaining walls at the entry to the court on East Figueroa Street which wrap around cottages A and B.
223A East Figueroa Street

223A East Figueroa Street, façade and west elevation. Facing northeast.

223A East Figueroa Street west elevation showing paired double-hung windows. Facing east.
Historic Integrity

This cottage, built in 1925, retains integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship, design, feeling and association, and is considered significant for its street presence and as a part of the working class vernacular cottage complex. It has high historic integrity and conveys its original appearance and sense of time and place of 1925. The garage, at the rear, added in 1956, is designed in a compatible style to the house but not considered significant.

223B East Figueroa Street
223B East Figueroa Street south façade showing paired double-hung windows. Facing north.

**Historic Integrity**

This cottage, built in 1925, retains integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship, design, feeling and association, and is considered significant for its street presence and as a part of the working class vernacular cottage complex. It has high historic integrity and conveys its original appearance and sense of time and place of 1925. The tool shed at the rear, built in 1950, is not considered significant.
223C East Figueroa Street

223C East Figueroa Street, façade and south elevation. Facing northeast.

223C East Figueroa Street, west elevation showing modern aluminum-frame windows. Facing east.
Historic Integrity

This vernacular cottage, built in 1925, was greatly altered in 2008 with the addition of a 200 square foot addition, a 60 square foot front porch with new column, new siding, gutters, roof, doors, windows, and dormer. The new design with its overscale front porch and inappropriate Victorian porch column and overscale dormer window removes its integrity of materials and design, although it does retain integrity of location, setting, and association. Because the materials are all not original, and its design removes its vernacular significance, it is therefore not considered significant because it no longer conveys its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1925.

223D East Figueroa Street

Historic Integrity

This cottage, built in 1925, retains its original siding, windows, and doors. In 1949 the front 11x13 sunroom was added. The dormer was added recently, although the exact date is unknown, and is not part of the original 1925 design. Because these alterations are compatible with the original materials and design, the cottage maintains integrity of design, materials, setting, location, feeling, and association, and is considered significant as a part of the working class vernacular cottage complex, as it is able to convey its original appearance as worker housing and sense of time and place of 1925.
223D East Figueroa showing original paired double-hung windows. Facing southwest.

223E East Figueroa Street, east elevations showing aluminum window. Facing northwest.
Historic Integrity

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, has been altered with a 204 square foot addition at the rear in 1977 and the replacement of the wood-framed windows with aluminum-framed windows. As a result, although it retains integrity of location and setting, it no longer retains integrity of materials, design, workmanship, feeling or association, and cannot convey its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1916. It therefore is not considered significant.
Historic Integrity

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, was altered in 1966 with the addition of an exterior brick chimney on the west elevation and a bay window on the south elevation (City permit #19932). Because these alterations are compatible with the original materials and design, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, the cottage retains integrity of design, materials, setting, location, feeling, and association, and is considered significant as a part of the working class vernacular cottage complex, as it is able to convey its original appearance and sense of time and place of 1916.
223G façade and east elevation showing modern plywood porch. Facing northwest.

223G East elevation showing replacement windows on east and north elevations. Facing southwest.
Modern storage units at rear of 223G. Facing northwest.

**Historic Integrity**

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, has been altered with the addition of casement windows on the east and north elevations, the change of a double-hung window oriented vertically to be oriented horizontally on the east elevation, and the addition of a modern plywood porch at the entrance. As a result, although it retains integrity of location and setting, it no longer retains integrity of materials, design, workmanship, feeling or association, and cannot convey its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1916. It therefore is not considered significant.
223H East Figueroa Street

223H East Figueroa Street, façade and west elevation showing added porch and picture window and vinyl slider window. Facing northeast.

Modern storage units at rear of 223H. Facing northeast.
**Historic Integrity**

This vernacular cottage, built in 1916, has been altered at an unknown date with a 173 square foot shed-roof addition on the façade, with picture windows on the façade and the east elevation and an entrance porch with a modern lattice screen. At some time a picture window was added on the west elevation. Some of the original windows have been replaced with aluminum-framed windows. Because of these incompatible alterations, although it retains integrity of location and setting, it no longer retains integrity of materials, design, workmanship, feeling or association, and cannot convey its original appearance or sense of time and place of 1916. It therefore is not considered significant.

223G, H, two storage buildings significance analysis continued

B. *Its location as the site of a significant historic event* The cottages are not the site of a significant historical event. They do not meet this criterion.

C. *Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation*; The cottages are not associated with a person or persons important to the culture or development of the city. None of the persons associated with the study property were identified as historically significant in biographical or historical sources. They do not meet this criterion.

D. *Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State or the Nation*; Although bungalow courts are considered important to Santa Barbara, because this complex of worker housing does not display the requisite spatial relationships and architectural unity to qualify as a bungalow court, it does not meet this criterion. Because of their alterations, Cottages C, E, G, and H no longer retain integrity to serve as elements of the vernacular style as seen in worker bungalow motor court housing of the first quarter of the twentieth century. They do not meet this criterion. However cottages A, B, D and F meet this criterion because they retain integrity of design.

E. *Its exemplification of the best remaining architectural type in a neighborhood*; Cottages G and H are hidden at the rear of the lot and are not considered the best remaining architectural type on the 200 block of East Figueroa Street. Cottages A and B of this complex, which front on East Figueroa Street, are good examples of the vernacular style. The cottages at 223G and 223H do not meet this criterion.

F. *Its identification as the creation, design or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation*; The building log indicates that the Sullivan Brothers constructed cottages E, F, G, and H in 1916. No information could be gleaned concerning this firm. The cottages do not meet this criterion. The building permits indicate that cottages A, B, C, and D were constructed by Jack Hayden in 1925. No information could be gleaned concerning this firm. The cottages do not meet this criterion.
G. *Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship*; Cottages G and H do not embody elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail and craftsmanship. The dwellings show materials and construction techniques typical of their time and display no high style architectural elements that were the result of outstanding craftsmanship, design or use of materials. The cottages do not meet this criterion. The ashlar cut sandstone wall in front of Cottages A and B and the architectural details in cottages A, B, and D meet this criterion, specifically the wood, double hung windows, and the porch design of the front two as they mimic each other. The design of the paired windows along the court is similar in all four 1925 cottages.

H. *Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark*; The cottages are not essential to the integrity of another landmark because they are not associated with any nearby landmark. The cottages do not meet this criterion.

I. *Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood*; The cottages 223G and 223H are hidden at the rear of the lot and are not considered an established visual feature of the neighborhood. The cottages at 223G and 223H do not meet this criterion. The cottages A and B meet this criterion as prominent cottages along East Figueroa Street.

J. *Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest*; The cottages’ potential for archaeological interest is not applicable to this report. The cottages do not meet this criterion.

K. *Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation*; The cottages are not considered a natural environment, and therefore do not contribute to the wellbeing of the city, state or nation. They do not meet this criterion.

4. **National Register of Historic Places criteria:** The court as a whole nor individual cottages do not qualify for listing on the National Register because their significance is not sufficiently elevated to qualify for national listing. They are not associated with an important historical event (Criterion A) or with historically significant persons (Criterion B); do not embody distinctive architectural features or craftsmanship (Criterion C); and are not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history (Criterion D).

**California Register of Historical Resources criteria:** For the same reasons discussed above, the cottages do not qualify under Criteria A, B, C, or D. As noted above, they are over 50 years old but do not retain their historical integrity. They do not meet this criterion.

5. **Any structure, site, or object associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community at large; or illustrates the broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history.**

Although bungalow courts represent a traditional way of life important to Santa Barbara from 1909 to the 1930s, this worker housing complex as a whole does not qualify as a
bungalow court and does not meet this criterion. The individual cottages are not associated with a traditional way of life important to any group or the community at large. They do not meet this criterion.

6. Any structure, site or object that conveys an important sense of time and place, or contributes to the overall visual character of a neighborhood or district.

At the entrance to the collection of cottages, the front four bungalows contribute to the overall visual character of the small collection as they read as a cohesive whole. Due to the lack of historic integrity and the random assortment of inappropriate materials on the rear four, they do not contribute to the collective visual character as you walk down the court.

7. Any structure, site, or object able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to historical, historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research.

The cottages are not able to yield information important to the community. Their potential relevance to historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research lies beyond the scope of this assessment. They do not meet this criterion.

8. Any structure, site or object determined by the City to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the City’s determination is based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record [Ref. State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a)(3).

The cottages are not listed on the City’s updated compilation of Landmarks, Structures of Merit, or Potential Historic Structures. They do not meet this criterion.

7. SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

In summary, cottages 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street, and 223A, 223B, 223D and 223F East Figueroa Street are considered eligible for listing as Structures of Merit. Cottage 226 East Anapamu Street, building 232 East Anapamu Street, and cottages 1117 and 1121 Garden Street and 223 C, E, G, and H East Figueroa Street are not considered significant.

The six cottages along East Anapamu and Garden Streets can be analyzed as well for their cumulative integrity of setting, how they contribute to the streetscape. In my professional opinion the three cottages along East Anapamu Street have lost integrity of setting because of the intrusion of the commercial streetscape, with 232 East Anapamu Street at the corner of Garden and Anapamu Streets, the Police Station parking lots in the center of the block, and the large commercial building on the corner of East Anapamu and Santa Barbara Streets. The two Queen Anne Free Style cottages relate to each other as architecturally a pair, but their presence is not enough to create a unified streetscape presence on East Anapamu Street. Conversely, the three cottages on Garden Street, part of the trio of 1905 cottages, although two are altered architecturally, maintain integrity of setting mid-block, with similar scale, setback, and massing.
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